

what the difference is? Our Tax Code says the one that moved overseas, you do not have to pay taxes to this country even though you manufacture the same product and ship it back to sell in Pittsburgh or Denver or Fargo. You do not have to pay taxes. The company in a State pays taxes out of its income, but you do not pay taxes out of your income because, as long as you move the company overseas, you can keep the income over there tax free until you are repatriated back. Most do not repatriate back, so they get a fat, juicy tax incentive for moving their plants overseas and closing their plants in this country.

It does not take smelling salts to get people clear-headed enough to understand that this is a fundamentally goofy provision in our tax law. If you cannot start with the first step in deciding that we are going to stop providing incentives for people to ship their jobs out of America and move their jobs overseas, then we do not have a ghost of a chance of solving our problem in this country with fewer jobs that pay well.

Why do I say that? People say there are more jobs in our country. Yes, there are more jobs. The fact is, there are also more people in our country, and the more jobs we are getting are not the kind of jobs that pay well. Too often they are service industry jobs that do not pay very well. Guess what kind of jobs are leaving? The manufacturing jobs that used to pay well with good benefits. What we need to do is shut the loophole that says move your jobs overseas and we will pay you to do it. Shut it and shut it immediately.

The piece of legislation I introduced last week, which I hope to have a number of votes on in the Congress, some hearings on, is very simple. There are two provisions in it. One says, shut the insidious loophole that says we will pay you if you move your jobs overseas. Just shut it down. End it. Just be done with it.

Second, you take the money from that, a little over \$2 billion, and you use it to provide tax credits for those who create new net jobs in our country. Those who create new jobs, more jobs now than they did over the previous couple-year base of their employment, they get a 25-percent tax credit on their payroll taxes, 25-percent tax credit for 2 years for the new jobs they create.

Let us use the savings by closing the loophole that exists to move jobs overseas and use those savings to provide an incentive to create jobs over here.

What could be more sensible than that? It is very simple: Yes or no, do we want to close the loophole that exists to send jobs overseas? Of course we do. We ought to. I had a vote here on the Senate last year and 52 Members voted to keep the loophole open. I will give them a chance to redeem themselves a couple of times this year. Should we close the loophole? Of course we should. Should we provide incentive to

keep jobs in this country? Of course we should.

This is a very simple proposition. This does not go into a big school to learn. This is not advanced math. You give people an incentive for moving their jobs, they will move them; provide people incentive to create jobs, you will have more jobs here.

Mr. President, S. 1597 is a piece of legislation—and I hope my colleagues will become acquainted with it because we will vote on it a number of times this year. I hope that enough colleagues will understand their constituents have an interest in it and will approve this. I would like to see one Member of the Senate go to one town meeting in one community in this country and stand up, and in the first sentence of the town meeting say, "By the way, I have a new idea. My idea is this: We should put in our Tax Code a little incentive that will reward companies who shut down their plants in America and move their jobs overseas." I think they would get booed out of the room before they get to the second sentence. That is what our Tax Code does. I am determined that we will shut that perverse, insidious incentive down, and we will do it soon.

That relates to the issue of jobs. Will that fix our jobs problem? No, but it will help. At least doctors understand to save the patient the first thing you do is stop the bleeding. That is what this bill is about.

CRIME

Mr. DORGAN. Now, the issue of crime. People want good jobs in our country. They also want to feel safe, and ours is a country with a serious crime challenge. I have a crime clock which shows the problem we have. One murder every 23 minutes; one forcible rape every 5 minutes; one robbery every 51 seconds; one aggravated assault every 28 seconds. We have 23,000 murders in America every year, and 110,000 rapes.

This is a country with a serious crime problem. I have said on the floor many times, and I want to repeat it, that it does not take Dick Tracy to understand who is going to commit the next violent crime. It is someone who committed a previous violent crime, and, in most cases, someone who has been in prison and who has been released early.

Earlier this week, I mentioned two recent cases, both of them in the Washington, DC, area. But I could stand up here and tell 3,400 similar stories, because 3,400 people have been murdered by people who should have been in prison and unable to murder anybody, but they were let out early. They were told that, since they behaved in prison, they would be let out early.

Here are two of these cases. One involves a young woman named Bettina Pruckmayr from Washington, DC, a young attorney, 26 years old, just starting her career here in Washington,

DC. She was allegedly abducted by a 38-year-old man named Leo Gonzales Wright on the evening of December 16. Mr. Wright abducted her and forced her to drive to an ATM machine. He has been linked to this crime through a bank security photo. He stabbed Bettina Pruckmayr, 38 times—7 times in the back, 3 times in the neck, and elsewhere in the body with sufficient force to break her bones. He killed her brutally.

Who is Leo Gonzales Wright, this man who allegedly killed Bettina Pruckmayr? This young attorney was killed by someone who should not have been able to kill an innocent person. He should have been in jail. He is a man who previously committed robbery, previously committed rape, previously committed murder, previously committed armed robbery. Despite rape, robbery, and murder, this man, at age 38, was walking around the streets of Washington, DC. In fact, after he was released early from prison, the police picked him up for selling drugs. But he was not put back in prison.

It does not take Sherlock Holmes to figure out who will commit the next crime. It is someone who should have been in prison, like this alleged killer—who had murdered before, robbed before, raped before—but who is walking the streets because someone in the criminal justice system said, "We want to let you out of prison early"—and did. The result is a 26-year-old young attorney named Bettina is dead. It should not have happened.

The second case involves a 13-year-old boy named Jonathan Hall, from Fairfax County, VA. I do not know much about Jonathan Hall except what I have heard on the news. Jonathan Hall was a young boy who was stabbed 58 times and thrown in a pond for dead. When they found him, they found grass and dirt between his fingers because he apparently, with 58 stab wounds, had tried to pull himself out of the pond. He was not dead when he was thrown into the pond, but he died.

The alleged killer of Jonathan is a fellow names James "Buck" Murray. James "Buck" Murray was sent to prison for murdering a cab driver a number of years ago. While he was in prison he was put on work release and he kidnapped a woman. Then, he murdered a fellow inmate. That is two murders and a kidnaping. And guess what? A few months ago he was walking the streets of Virginia, a free person, because the criminal justice system apparently felt it was OK that he could get out early. And now a 13-year-old boy is dead because a person who should have been in prison was walking the streets.

There are 3,400 other murder stories just like these. I have had some arguments with the folks in my State about the criminal justice system's approach to letting people out early. Here are the early release policies of some States, which I bet most people do not know. I will not go through and name

all of the States. Here is a State near the top of the alphabet that says to a violent criminal, every year you serve in prison you get 540 days off for good time. In other words, for every year you serve, you get out almost 2 years early. Serve 10 years—people say it is a big deal that we now say to violent criminals you have to serve 85 percent of their sentences. They get sentenced 10 years, they serve 85 percent of that time, and a violent criminal is out early. The average violent offender is now sentenced to a 20-year term and serves less than half of that sentence. The average person serving time in prison for murder in America serves only 7 years.

The States say, "If you are good in prison, we will let you out early." Then, people like Bettina and Jonathan and others get murdered because we decided we cannot afford to keep violent people in prison where they belong—180 days a year, good time credits for every year you serve, half a year off. Here is 180 days, 120 days, 365 days, 400 days, 547 days. These are the number of days of good time that the States give to these people. "If you are good in prison, no matter how violent you are, we let you out early." This has to stop. This sort of thing cannot continue in our country.

If we, as a country cannot assure the safety of innocent people by deciding that those who commit violent acts, those who commit murder, will go to prison and stay there until the end of their sentence, if we cannot assure people we will keep these folks off the street, then we, in my judgment, have not done our job. Most of this has to do with State government. In fact, all of this does.

Nobody is let out of the Federal system early. There is no automatic good time credit for being good in the Federal system. The last crime bill eliminated that because of my provision that said that we are going to get rid of good time. I want the States to do the same thing. If you are a violent criminal, no good time for good behavior. You are going to be sent to prison to be kept off the streets.

I am introducing legislation next week called the SAFER Act, the Stop Allowing Felons Early Release Act. I want to distinguish between the felons in prison who are violent versus those who are not. I want prisoners who committed violent crimes to know that when they go in prison, they are going to stay in prison until the end of their term. My bill provides an incentive through the Federal truth in sentencing grant program to eliminate parole and good time credits for violent offenders.

We have an amount of money under the truth in sentencing grant program for prison construction, and for other purposes, that is allocated to eligible States. I would reduce these grants by 25 percent for the States that have not decided to end early release for violent criminals. For those States who have

decided they will end early release for violent criminals, they will participate fully in this grant program and receive an incentive payment.

If a State decides it does not want to do that, that it wants to keep moving violent prisoners back to the streets, then they will lose a portion of this incentive grant program.

My legislation is simple. It will not force the States to do anything, but it will say to them, with the amount of money that we are using here in the Congress, in the crime bill, we want to at least try to provide incentive to those States that do the right thing. The right thing is to start deciding all across this country, especially in the State criminal justice systems, that violent people sent to prison will stay in prison.

It is probably hard to know how some of these families feel, especially when they discover their loved one has been killed by somebody who should not have been in a position to kill anybody. My mother was killed in a manslaughter incident. It was not the kind of incident I have described with Jonathan Hall and Bettina Pruckmayr, but I understand getting a telephone call about having a loved one involved in this kind of a crime, having a loved one lose her life in a violent crime. I can only imagine how families feel when they hear that their daughter or their mother or their son has been killed, and then they discover that the perpetrator was someone who has murdered two other people and spent a fraction of the time they should have spent in jail, but who, because the State let them out early, was in their neighborhood threatening their lives and their children's lives.

This country has to do better than that. This country has to decide there are some criminals who, by their acts of violence, demonstrate that they deserve no good time, no early release. The American people deserve to have those people sentenced and put away in a prison cell until the end of their term.

I hope very much that, as we discuss a crime bill this year and continue to work through the questions that confront the American people about jobs and crime and health care and education, and the range of issues that people care about and want us to do something about, we will take a look at this issue. Do we not have an obligation, when we have a person who has committed a murder, a kidnapping, another murder, to decide that this person does not deserve to be on our streets? Do we not have that responsibility? If the State governments do not exercise that responsibility, do we not have the right to try to provide some incentive and initiative there? I think we do.

This issue of devolution that we are talking about now in the Congress is that the Federal Government cannot do anything right, so we should send it all back to the State and local govern-

ments. These cases I am talking about are all State cases. Nobody is getting out of the Federal prisons early to do this. We have determinate sentencing, and there is no good time because I saw to it.

In the State judicial systems, you can earn up to 2 years off of your sentence for every year served. All you have to do is be good. Half of our prison population in America are nonviolent prisoners. Half of them are convicted of violent crimes. I want us as a country to distinguish between the two. I want prison cells open and available for those who have committed violent acts. Jonathan Hall should not be dead today, nor should Bettina Pruckmayr, nor should 3,400 other Americans killed by people let out early, who should have still been in prison. I hope we will discuss this at some great length this year as we discuss the crime bill.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUGAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa.

DRUG POLICY, DRUG TRENDS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, recent information from a wide variety of sources make two things very clear about the issue of drug policy, drug trends and the problems it causes, and that is that teenage drug use is on the rise, a disturbingly fast rise, and also that the American public remains very concerned about the need for counter-drug policies that are effective.

We know from virtually every survey, every reporting mechanism on drug use that adolescent use is on a rocket ride into the upper atmosphere. We know from hospital data that emergency room admissions are on the increase and that many of these involve young people. Late last year, we had firm confirmation of just how bad things are and where they are headed.

The administration released the latest high school survey. These data make it abundantly clear that not only is use of drugs going up, but youthful attitude toward the dangers of drug use are changing and changing for the worst. The best spin that the administration could put on the data was somehow, "Well, it's not as bad as it was in 1979."

Just what sort of a comment does that say? It notes that since 1992, the proportion of 10th graders using illicit